

Date: Wed, 28 Apr 93 00:38:51 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #117
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 28 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 117

Today's Topics:

 CW = effective utilization?
 MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
 My thoughts...
 no-code defense
 rec.radio.amateur reorg - final proposal after 30-day discussion

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 26 Apr 93 20:08:18 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!msuinfo!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW = effective utilization?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
: In article <1993Apr20.223358.389@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
: >I suspect that there are already more TNCs in use than keyers despite
: >their higher cost.
:
: First, how many of those TNCs are HF capable. Not the majority. Second,
: yes, there are plenty of TNCs out there, but you also have to take into
: account that of those who own TNCs, most own more than one. So just counting
: TNCs sold doesn't translate to real information.
:
: >And the LOWFER system already far exceeds conventional CW performance

: >in bandwidth and weak signal performance. It can be built for under
: >\$100.

: Yes, but unless you can show that the vast majority will use such systems
: exclusively, opening up the bands as proposed would overload the spectrum.

Why does the above apply to LOWFER and not to CW. (ie. if we can't assure that everyone will use CW why should we make it required) Listen to the HF bands although everyone is supposed to know code to get on what do you here more often. 'the QRM is really getting bad lets switch over to cw' or 'Gee the band really sounds bad let me flip on my amp'?

: --
: -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
: ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Mon, 26 Apr 93 21:06:44 GMT
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!
dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com> dstine@cisco.com (David Stine)
writes:

>In article <1993Apr8.195154.1@engvms.unl.edu> tmrpsrs@engvms.unl.edu writes:
>>I have recently been tuning around the 4 MHz band in the early evenings and
>>am having fun tuning in MARS broadcasts (That's MILITARY AFFILIATE RADIO
>>SERVICE...NOT the Red Planet...but it is funny if you think about it that like
>>that :)). Anyway, i'm tuning in stuff like the Civil Air Patrol and stuff.
>>

>>My question is: What is MARS for anyway? seems like just message handling
>>and ragchewing. are there schedules for different nets? The Confidential
>>Frequency List shows a lot of MARS freqs, but not any times of transmission.
>>So, what's the scoop?

>

>- What's MARS for? MARS has two purposes; 1) to pass health & welfare
> traffic, including phone patches, from military personnel to family &
> friends and 2) to serve as an emergency communications resource to
> be tapped by state governments in times of emergency. Overall, I'd
> have to say that the level of training is better on MARS nets than
> on the ARRL nets; if I wanted to send a message in a crisis and
> get it there in a hurry, I'd try to introduce it into the MARS
> system before the ARRL traffic nets.

>

It is funny you mention the Confidential Frequency List with respect to MARS. One morning on the local 2m repeater, one guy is complaining that the used HT he bought had a strange repeater programmed in one of the memories. The input was something around 143.5 Mhz, and the output was 148.7 Mhz (or something like that). I suggested it might be MARS, which conjured a real MARS operator, who would not confirm or deny if these freqs were indeed MARS freqs. Furthermore, the MARS operator explained that they never discuss the real frequencies on the air, but instead use designators.

I started laughing and asked "Isn't that intentionally obscuring the meaning of your transmission?". She answered "No, we just don't want people to know what our frequencies are so they don't jam us." I said "But a designator is a coded transmission if you use it to obscure the meaning". She said "We're not obscuring the meaning, we just don't want jammers to know our frequencies".

I can understand her concern, but I nonetheless found it hilarious she would not admit that using a code to obscure meaning was using a code to obscure meaning.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Sat, 24 Apr 1993 21:31:12 GMT

From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!
theporch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: My thoughts...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dthomas@bbx.basis.com (Dave Thomas) writes:

> I think the world is a far different place than it used to be. Way back
> when, if you wanted to get on the ham bands, you generally built gear.
Sigh. A newbie with nostalgia. Yes, and it was a function of money. I
was a kid and had none. It was also a function of availability: there
were not mail order and electronic stores on every corner...But, the
guys at the TV repair place would gladly let us haul off the overflow
of dead sets to be used as parts, and because many of them were hams,
we learned a great deal through experiementing.... HOWEVER...

> But I've found the answer, I think. The *real* radio amateurs of today are
> on the illegal "upper" CB channels (27.555 Mhz et al).
This is simply NOT so! In amoment I will point out only a small part
of why...

> There is nothing wrong with taking a test,
> getting a license, buying a radio and shooting the breeze with 60 year
> olds. I just have little to say to such folks.

Me either...unless the 60-year-old has not lost his sense for life and
knows how to converse and not just scream signal reports and station
descriptions into an overdriven speech-processor. I had a most
interesting chat with a chap from Montana the other day. Lasted about
30 miles across the backroads I drive...say 45 minutes or so...and we
never did talk about radios. Just the climate and environment where we
were, what we did, things we had in common -- I rode a bicycle across
the continent (twice, once fast and once slow) and we talked about
different places in Montana. I even know a great place to have
breakfast on Sunday mornings in Helena! Orv was 77 years young, and a
hoot to talk with. Don't let the stereotype drive your hamming.
Make'em talk to you, and just tell'em when it gets real boring and
standardized. Don't let the OFs do teh cookie-cutter QSO! :^)

> The folks on those illegal CB channels got there by modifying their radios
> themselves, and are truly interested in the workings of radio.
NOT!!!!

I know several of these chaps, and they *ALL* paid someone, usually a
ham in need of some cash, for the mods. Listen for a few minutes and
see what they really know about antennas and feedlines...probably even
less than on 2 meters, and that is pretty dismal. These guys call our
store all the time asking about adjusting the "clarifier" and making
their radio automatically detect whether someone is on upper or lower
sideband and set it for them, because they have problems all getting
on the same frequency... these are the "real radio people of today?" I
hope not. :-(

> And I'm screwed because if it were made legal, commercial
> rigs would be widely available and the hackers would be outnumbered and
> forced elsewhere.

I don't think you have thought much about this, judging from your
post. There are plenty of places to have loads of fun in amateur
radio. Tell me more about what excites you, and maybe I can direct you
to frequencies and areas where many share those interests... it won't
be a law-breaker requirement, either.

73

```
+-----+
| Jack GF Hill      |Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |
| P. O. Box 1685    |Modem: (615) 377-5980 -      Compu$erve 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024|jackhill@jackatak.raider.net -      Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+
```

Date: 27 Apr 1993 21:36:23 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!master.cs.rose-hulman.edu!
master.cs.rose-hulman.edu!news@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr26.153446.18150@leland.Stanford.EDU>
paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
> This thread has pretty much veered in the direction of
rec.radio.amateur.policy
> and followups should wind up there, not here.
>
>
> --
> --Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
> ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

AAAA MMMM EEEE NNNN !!!!

'CUN

Date: 27 Apr 93 07:10:51 GMT
From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: rec.radio.amateur reorg - final proposal after 30-day discussion
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Results of the discussion on the rec.radio.amateur reorganization

30-day discussion period ended: April 26, 1993

Based on a Request for Discussion (RFD), a discussion of a possible reorganization of rec.radio.amateur was held for 30 days on the news.groups newsgroup. The location of the discussion was required by the "Guidelines for UseNet Newsgroup Creation" and was announced many times in the rec.radio.amateur.* newsgroups.

The result of the 30-day discussion appears favorable so we will proceed with the next step in the guidelines. A Call for Votes (CFV) will be issued as soon as arrangements for voting can be made. (See "Notes on how to proceed with the CFV" below.)

Unchanged Newsgroups

It was agreed that these newsgroups will not change. They will not be on the CFV.

rec.radio.amateur.misc	all Ham radio topics not covered below
rec.radio.amateur.policy	regulations & policy issues

Newsgroups That Will Be on the CFV

All of these groups are UNMODERATED.

rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc	packet radio & other digital modes [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet]
rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip	TCP/IP via packet radio
rec.radio.amateur.dx	DX (long distance) communications
rec.radio.amateur.antenna	discussion of amateur radio antennas
rec.radio.amateur.equipment	amateur radio equipment: manufactured products, modifications
rec.radio.amateur.instruction	Ham radio instruction & examination
rec.radio.amateur.operating	discussion of operating procedures
rec.radio.amateur.homebrew	radio construction & experimentation
rec.radio.amateur.space	amateur radio in space: satellites, earth-moon-earth (EME), shuttle, MIR
rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services	emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS
rec.radio.amateur.rdf	radio direction finding: recreational hunts and searches for interference

Notes on how to proceed with the CFV

The guidelines say that there should be minimal delay between the close of the

discussion period and the posting of a CFV. In order to comply with that, we'll take this back to the rra-reorg mail list. If you would like to join the discussion to help review the final wording of the CFV, send mail to

Internet mail: rra-reorg-request@amdahl.com

UUCP mail: amdahl!rra-reorg-request

and you will be added to the list.

All decisions made in the discussion period will be held UNMODIFIABLE in the writing of the CFV. The scope of the discussion will encompass wording of a proper CFV based on this discussion and arrangements for a vote-collecting site. This may include filling out the wording of the newsgroup charters but not changing their intent.

Note: the 4/24 "evolving proposal" said that we might use MIT's offer to host newsgroup votes. As it turns out, that may not be possible because the student/employee who handles that is in the crunch period prior to graduation. The members of the rra-reorg mail list will need to determine an acceptable site for the voting.

— —

Ian Klufft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
iklufft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA

[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

Date: Mon, 26 Apr 1993 05:27:27 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Ny6a3B1w165w@stock.apana.org.au>, <1993Apr20.213614.29801@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Apr21.000247.26363@samba.oit.unc.edu>

Subject : Re: My thoughts...

In article <1993Apr21.000247.26363@samba.oit.unc.edu> Kirk.Smith@launchpad.unc.edu (Kirk Smith) writes:

>

>This latest thread about 2m=CB has gotten me thinking. How is using an
>outdated mode of communications (ie: CW) to do contesting, ragchews,
>and signal report exchanges to get that coveted QSL card so much more
>"experimental" or justified than a 2m rag-chew?

Huh? How is 2m FM, where we while away the hours with inane yakking during rush hour more "advanced" than the "outdated" CW?

It seems to mee that
>there's room in amateur radio for everyone, whether they're hard-core
>hardware hackers into building their entire system themselves (I can
>only assume you're not reading handbooks to get your design plans) or
>someone interested in doing public safety comms, learning about simple
>antenna design, writing packet software, contesting, or whatever suits
>their fancy.
>
>I read this newsgroup for more than two years prior to taking the exam
>and getting licensed, and the cw bigots didn't scare me away. I can
>only hope that other newcomers aren't scared away from this great
>hobby.
>
>-ks
>KD6RCT
>
>--
> The opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University of
> North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Campus Office for Information
> Technology, or the Experimental Bulletin Board Service.
> internet: laUNChpad.unc.edu or 152.2.22.80

--

	tad@ssc.com	(if it bounces, use 3288544@mcimail.com)	
	Tad Cook	Packet Amateur Radio:	Home Phone:
	Seattle, WA	KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA	206-527-4089

Date: 26 Apr 93 09:35:15 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!darwin.sura.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!

nobody@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr8.195154.1@engvms.unl.edu>, <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com>,
<1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>p

Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>I can understand her concern, but I nonetheless found it hilarious she
>would not admit that using a code to obscure meaning was using a code to
>obscure meaning.

Is it not true that MARS operates near but outside amateur bands? Are
MARS operators required to comply with FCC rules for Amateur operators
or does DOD have its own set of rules to use on MARS bands?

It seems likely that DOD can obscure any meanings it wants to outside the amateur bands...

Craig
(Waiting for my ticket...)

--

Craig Bosworth (619) 592-8609
Hewlett-Packard, San Diego Division
craigb@sdd.hp.com

Date: 27 Apr 93 13:15:24 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!swrinde!gatech!mailer.cc.fsu.edu!geomag!
zateslo@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com>, <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>,
<1rhrjjINN1bi@hpsdl136.sdd.hp.com>
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1rhrjjINN1bi@hpsdl136.sdd.hp.com> craigb@sdd.hp.com (Craig Bosworth) writes:

>
>Is it not true that MARS operates near but outside amateur bands? Are
>MARS operators required to comply with FCC rules for Amateur operators
>or does DOD have its own set of rules to use on MARS bands?
>
>It seems likely that DOD can obscure any meanings it wants to outside
>the amateur bands...
>

You got it. MARS is entirely a DOD operation, on government frequencies. The fact that civilian MARS operators are all (or almost all) licensed hams is just MARS policy. The military can (and indeed must, sometimes) keep things as obscure as possible, and they _are_ allowed to use codes and ciphers... :-)

Ted Zateslo, W1X0
zateslo@geomag.gly.fsu.edu

Date: Tue, 27 Apr 93 23:40:27 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!netsys!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
calvin!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930421.132111.7A2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,
<1993Apr21.183910.12625@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <C65nuo.DD5@squam.banyan.com>
Subject : Re: 00 != Slow

In article <C65nuo.DD5@squam.banyan.com> dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:
>Which takes NOTHING away from the previous point. I entered the hobby via the
>new technician class.

Yes, but we're not discussing the entry level or entry level privileges here.
We're discussing whether or not learning to use CW is relevant or desirable
for the average ham.

>and learned that they are simply another form of bigotry.

Both sides in this discussion seem to be quite happy to sling ad hom phrases
at will. I've been presenting this in what I hope is a bit more productive
mode. If you want me to continue, you might want to consider doing likewise.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Tue, 27 Apr 1993 18:39:59 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!dts@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr20.192221.8303@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<930421.132111.7A2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,
<1993Apr21.183910.12625@leland.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: 00 != Slow

In article <1993Apr21.183910.12625@leland.Stanford.EDU>, paulf@calvin.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

|> In article <930421.132111.7A2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>
system@garlic.sbs.com (Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

|> >Hmmm... have you seen the W5YI report? It seems to indicate that the
|> >codeless license has overtaken the novice entry route.
|>

|> Yes, but according to the FCC, 2/3 of the codeless licensees have upgraded
|> to Tech Plus.

Which takes NOTHING away from the previous point. I entered the hobby via the new
technician class. The fact that I passed the 5 WPM exam before my ticket actually

showed up has NO bearing on the fact that I did not and WOULD NOT enter the hobby until the creation of the new technician class license. I did have a novice ticket 18 years ago and was CAPABLE of learning the code, but had no interest in doing so as a form of initiation. I had enough of initiation rituals in college, and learned that they are simply another form of bigotry.

|>

|>

|> --

|> -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."

|> ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

--

```
-----
Daniel Senie                Internet:      dts@banyan.com
Banyan Systems, Inc.        Compuserve:    74176,1347
508-898-1188                Packet Radio: N1JEB@WA1PHY.MA
-----
```

Date: 27 Apr 93 18:29:27 GMT

From: ogicse!das-news.harvard.edu!noc.near.net!squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!

dts@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr20.161800.3415@leland.Stanford.EDU>,

<C5syJE.C1x@squam.banyan.com>, <1993Apr23.144538.8318@ve6mgs.ampr.org>

Subject : Re: CW = effective utilization?

In article <1993Apr23.144538.8318@ve6mgs.ampr.org>, mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

|> dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:

|>

|> >OK, so crank up your keyer to 20 or 30 WPM and turn on the spectrum analyzer

|> >and tell me how wide your transmitted signal is.

|>

|> Sorry, my CW budget doesn't allow for a spectrum analyzer, but funny, my

|> CW signal is passing through a mechanical 100Hz key klick filter ...

My budget doesn't either. So I am BUILDING one. It's a pretty inexpensive thing to construct.

You actually filter your transmitted RF through a 100 Hz filter after the finals? Filter must get REAL hot...

There WILL be harmonics generated by the squared-off edges of your on-off keying of the carrier sine wave.

|>

|> Ciao -- Mark
|> What! you are running 1KW on CW to talk to your neighbor across the street?

--

Daniel Senie Internet: dts@banyan.com
Banyan Systems, Inc. Compuserve: 74176,1347
508-898-1188 Packet Radio: N1JEB@WA1PHY.MA

Date: Tue, 27 Apr 1993 21:53:36 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!
n4tii@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr8.195154.1@engvms.unl.edu>, <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com>,
<1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>In article <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com> dstine@cisco.com (David Stine)
writes:

>>In article <1993Apr8.195154.1@engvms.unl.edu> tmdpsrs@engvms.unl.edu writes:
>>>I have recently been tuning around the 4 MHz band in the early evenings and
>>>am having fun tuning in MARS broadcasts (That's MILITARY AFFILIATE RADIO
>>>SERVICE...NOT the Red Planet...but it is funny if you think about it that like
>>>that :)). Anyway, i'm tuning in stuff like the Civil Air Patrol and stuff.
>>>

>>>My question is: What is MARS for anyway? seems like just message handling
>>>and ragchewing. are there schedules for different nets? The Confidential
>>>Frequency List shows a lot of MARS freqs, but not any times of transmission.
>>>So, what's the scoop?

>>

>>- What's MARS for? MARS has two purposes; 1) to pass health & welfare
>> traffic, including phone patches, from military personnel to family &
>> friends and 2) to serve as an emergency communications resource to
>> be tapped by state governments in times of emergency. Overall, I'd
>> have to say that the level of training is better on MARS nets than
>> on the ARRL nets; if I wanted to send a message in a crisis and
>> get it there in a hurry, I'd try to introduce it into the MARS
>> system before the ARRL traffic nets.
>>

>It is funny you mention the Confidential Frequency List with respect to
>MARS. One morning on the local 2m repeater, one guy is complaining that
>the used HT he bought had a strange repeater programmed in one of the

>memories. The input was something around 143.5 Mhz, and the output was
>148.7 Mhz (or something like that). I suggested it might be MARS, which
>conjured a real MARS operator, who would not confirm or deny if these
>freqs were indeed MARS freqs. Furthermore, the MARS operator explained
>that they never discuss the real frequencies on the air, but instead
>use designators.

>I started laughing and asked "Isn't that intentionally obscuring the
>meaning of your transmission?". She answered "No, we just don't want
>people to know what our frequencies are so they don't jam us." I said
>"But a designator is a coded transmission if you use it to obscure the
>meaning". She said "We're not obscuring the meaning, we just don't
>want jammers to know our frequencies".

>I can understand her concern, but I nonetheless found it hilarious she
>would not admit that using a code to obscure meaning was using a code to
>obscure meaning.

>--

> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are
*
> * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily
*
> * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*

> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM testssdf

*Sorry, I don't know this editor that well.....anyway...I'm in Air Force
MARS and no we do not discuss radio frequencies on the air. We refer to
all the frequencies in the form of a designator.

The reason why we do this is for national security. And, yes, it is to
obscure the meaning of the transmission...the casual listener does not
need to know everything MARS does. In the interest of national security,
in time of war or something, if sensitive traffic was being routed thru
MARS, we don't want "Charlie" following us across the band.

BTW, I'll deny those two freqs you had listed...they're not Air Force MARS.

John

John Reed
AFA2FH N4TII
n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #117
